

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010208US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10208

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 13, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 13, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 12, 19, and 23 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure

Examiner objects to the Abstract of the Disclosure because the abstract is written less than 50 words in length. Examiner cites MPEP § 608.01(d) ¶ 6.16, which states "The abstract *should* be ... *generally* limited to a single paragraph ... within the range of 50 to 150 words..." (emphasis added). As evident from the added emphasis, the length of the abstract is *permissive* and not mandatory. Applicants respectfully submit that the abstract may be less than 50 words as long as the abstract "describe[s] the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details." See *id.* Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract of the Disclosure is clear and concise and assists readers in deciding whether or not to consult the patent text for details. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *McMahan et al*, US 5,337,269 (hereinafter "*McMahan*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

Page 7

351339_1

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010208US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10208

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *McMahan* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". With respect to claims 1 and 12, the claims recite at least first and second sub-ALUs, each sub-ALU configured to operate on at least two multi-bit numbers to generate a multi-bit output result. See, e.g. Claim 1. *McMahan* does not disclose at least first and second sub-ALUs, each sub-ALU configured to operate on at least two multi-bit numbers to generate a multi-bit output result.

The Examiner states that *McMahan* discloses first sub-ALUs in Figure 1, Items 14a-14e, and second sub-ALUs in Figure 1, Items 12a-12g. The cited figure shows adder blocks (Items 12a-12g) and AND gates (Items 14a-14e). See Col. 3, Lines 61-68. The inputs to any one AND gate is a carry-out and a propagate term. See Col. 4, Lines 8-10. The carry-out is not part of a multi-bit number, nor is the propagate term. See *id.* Accordingly, *McMahan* does not disclose at least first and second sub-ALUs, as claimed.

With respect to claims 19 and 23, the claims recite a first ALU having a first input side and a first output side and a second ALU having a second input side and a second output side. Examiner cites to Fig. 1 of *McMahan* as describing a first ALU having a first input side and a first output side and a second ALU having a second input side and a second output side. Examiner refers to Items 12a-12g and 16a-16g as first ALUs and Items 14a-14g as a second ALU. Applicants note that the cited items are blocks and gates in a single carry-skip adder, Item 10. See Fig. 1, Item 10; Col. 3, Lines 62-68. Accordingly, Fig. 1 only depicts a portion of an ALU (the carry-skip adder, Item 10), and does not depict a first ALU and a second ALU.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1-26 are patentable over *McMahan*. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010208US1
MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10208

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants